

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/866,283 | RUNDELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Teresa E Strzelecka | 1637 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: pending

(1) Teresa E Strzelecka.

(3) _____.

(2) Raquel Alvarez.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 June 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

4, 28

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Teresa Strzelecka
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

6/28/04
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 4 and 28 as amended on May 25, 2004 were not ver clear because of the limitation "wherein said dropwise is about 2 drops per second". Since the independent claims 1 and 24 contain the limitation "adding said solution dropwise", the claims 4 and 28 would be clearer if the limitation would read "said dropwise addition". Claim 28 also contains the word "said" twice. Ms. Alvarez agreed to have the changes made by Examiner's amendment.